

United States District Court
Southern District of Texas
Corpus Christi Division

United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED

JUL 15 2020

David J. Bradley, Clerk of Court

ms. Bobbie David Haverkamp
Plaintiff

vs.

Civil action

2:17-cv-18

Rodney Burrow, Preston Johnson, John
Barruss, Erin Wyrick, Jeffery Beeson,
Dee Budgewater

Defendants

Objection to D.E 158

Objection to DE 186

Asking for the University directors of
mental health Services and Universal
regional or Senior medical authorities
for the treatment plans and hormones
therapy related to G.I.D

Plaintiff objection
to Document 186 and
with side objections to Docket 158

To the honorable Judge of said Court,

now Comes,

ms. Bobbie, AKA the Plaintiff and objects to the Memorandum and
Recommendations to deny the motions to intervene.

Your Honor, the Plaintiff will take this by the numbers so her
objections will follow order

1) Your Honor, in the July 2, 2020 tel-conference, the Plaintiff had no advance warning of the tel-conference. The Plaintiff walked into that conference completely blank

The Plaintiff already has a sense of inadequacy in presenting her case. The Plaintiff cannot fully explain the theory of relativity, Tesla transformer or why exploding a hydrogen bomb in the earth's atmosphere can change the jet stream

Going into the tel-conference adds to the Plaintiff inadequacy when she had no preparation against three skilled attorneys

The Plaintiff receives Dkt #186 and finds out that D.E. 174 was their response to intervene, DE 174 was never mailed.

2) The Plaintiff objects, the question is raised a second time do the Defendants have any standing to object to anything in Civil action 2:17-cv-18 when the tel-conference clearly pointed out that they could not be sued or sue. It also is clearly pointed out that the Defendants refuse to wear the Hat of acting for the 'Doe's' in the present Civil action

3) How do they have standing to object to anything in the present civil action? When the Attorneys said they could not proceed relay and doesn't know who can.

Dear Honor, the Plaintiff needs an answer, this is an appeal

4) The Court in the April 3, 2020, 'order Setting deadlines', #4, 'leave of court is required to amend pleadings or to join additional parties, usual Fed. R. Civ. P. 24

It's clear the court is following FRCP rules, yet in the

tel-conference FRCP rules that a FRCP 12 motion are not allowed after a dismissal of the Defendants motion to dismiss.

The tel-conference gave the impression that the court was considering the Defendants motion to dismiss, again!! , against FRCP rules.

The Plaintiff has filed her objections in a timely fashion, but the fact remains that the Defendants attorneys clearly pointed out the Defendants, Barrow, Johnson, Barruss, Wyck, Beeson, Budgewater could not be sued or sue. The Plaintiff clearly understood that the above Defendants refused to accept under any circumstances responsibility.

They have no legal standing by their own admission to the court.

5) The Plaintiff acknowledges the courts acceptance that the 5th circuit said gender reassignment surgery and non-invasive procedures were accepted medical treatment for the Plaintiff. ①

Your Honor here's my objection, the court on page 4/6, 2nd paragraph, last sentence said "... to overcome the "presumption that the Plaintiff can adequately represent their overall interest"

The Plaintiff objects and strongly to the intervention Defendants

A. The intervention Defendants have no right to say that the Plaintiff can, adequately represent their overall interest."

Your Honor, the Plaintiff does not accept that Burden. There's no mental health that non-invasive treatments under the 5th circuit describe, so ms. Seat has already tried to commit suicide and two days ago ms. Selene cut another part of her testicals out. No, she did not get

① page 1/6 - Last sentence

help, the nurse gave her a bandage and sent her on her way.

The intervention Defendants need to adequately represent the intervenors, but they won't, they cannot be sued or sue and they will not accept the responsibility of care for transgenders.

Your Honor, the Plaintiff cannot even get the standard of care and treatment plan to care for herself and they want me to represent their overall interest.

Your Honor, tell them to go get a life (Defendants)

With the greatest respect to the court, on page 9 of 37, last paragraph

"Gender Reassignment in this case involves only the Plaintiff who is a transgender woman." Non-invasive treatments fall into the same box, involves only the Plaintiff

The Plaintiff objects to the Defendants being given Standing when they stand on how that they cannot be sued or sue and they refused to accept responsibility to provide relief according to the Court Order dated February 24, 2017, I never sued these people. PERIOD.

Expect a Appeal on Standing.

I object respectfully
ms. Bobbie

Your Honor, accept the premise of the Defendants Attorney, the new defendants said they cannot be sued or sue and they refuse to represent the Does. Their own admission and reasoning kicks them off

the Civ. I sent in Docket 158, Motion to Dismiss.

Then if we coupled FRCP 12 motions that all defenses have to be brought forward or are lost. So, why didn't equal protection, 4th Comm. He, the PLRA issue, Injunction Relief make it into the 12(b)(6) motions to dismiss, Who knows!! but that's the Defendants Attorney's call, The Rules don't allow us to go back,

The Plaintiff again lodges objections to Docket 158 and objections to Docket 186.

So prays the Plaintiff
Ms Bobbie

Styles Unit

July 13, 2020

Certificate of Service.

On July 13, 2020, Ms Bobbie AKA the Plaintiff swears under the penalty of perjury that this was mail to the Clerk of the Court with instruction to file with the Court and forward a copy to the following Attorneys

1. Texas Attorney General - Corbello

P.O. 12548

Austin, Texas 78711-2548

2. Rights Behind Bars

Samuel Weiss - Attorney

416 Florida Avenue NW 26152

Washington, D.C.

So Swears the Plaintiff

Ms Bobbie

July 13, 2020.

20001